

JACQUES CRAIG FLOYD,

Plaintiff,

v.

A. HERGENROTHER, et al.,

Defendants.

THIS MATTER is before the Court on Plaintiff's Motion for Discovery, (Doc. No. 12), and Motion to Deny Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment or at Least to Stay Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment, (Doc. No. 20), which appears to be based on Defendants' alleged failure to provide discovery.¹ A comparison of the Exhibits annexed to Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment reveals that much, if not all, of the discoverable material sought by Plaintiff is found in such exhibits. (Doc. Nos. 17-1; 17-2). The Court finds that Plaintiff was, therefore, provided sufficient relevant information to formulate a response to the Motion for Summary Judgment and has in fact submitted such response to the court. See (Doc. No. 19).

1. Plaintiff's Motion for Discovery, (Doc. No. 12), is **DENIED**; and
2. Plaintiff's Motion to Deny Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment or at Least to Stay Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment, (Doc. No. 20), is **DENIED**. The parties are notified that the briefing has now closed, Defendants' Motion for Summary Judgment, (Doc. No. 16), is ripe, and the

¹ The Court notes that the scheduling order in this case provided for the filing of dispositive motions, not discovery. See (Doc. No. 8).

Court will enter an Order on the Motion within a reasonable time.

Signed: February 13, 2012

A handwritten signature in cursive script, reading "Robert J. Conrad, Jr.", written over a horizontal line.

Robert J. Conrad, Jr.
Chief United States District Judge

